

I take this minute, Mr. Speaker, because I want to make a unanimous consent request and I think it should be explained.

I agree with the President that there is immediate need for action on the soldiers' vote bill. A good many of us have been hoping we could have action for the last month. To show our sincerity in having action not next week but right now, I ask unanimous consent that the House immediately take up the bill which is on the Union Calendar known as S. 1285. the soldiers' voting bill.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Massachusetts was not recognized for that purpose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

§ 7. Special-order Speeches

Like one-minute speeches, special-order speeches are not specifically provided for by the rules of the House. Special orders to address the House (for the purpose of debate only) may extend up to one hour and must follow the legislative business for the day.⁽¹⁾

1. For discussion of the evolution of the present practice as to special-order speeches, see § 7.1, *infra*.

Special-order speeches are strictly limited to one hour (see § 7.5, *infra*).

For further discussion of special-order speeches as related to recognition and debate, see Ch. 29, *infra*.

Such speeches must be distinguished from one-minute speeches, which under normal practice are limited to one minute and precede the legislative business of the day.⁽²⁾ The order of special-order speeches may be varied. For example, where further legislative business is scheduled but is not yet ready for consideration, the Speaker may recognize for special-order speeches with the understanding that legislative business will be resumed.⁽³⁾ Once special orders have begun, the Speaker generally declines to recognize for legislative business, although there is no rule to prohibit the resumption of business.⁽⁴⁾

Special orders are taken up in the sequence in which they were

And for discussion of the recently adopted prohibition on points of no quorum during special-order speeches, see supplements to this edition.

2. On occasion, one-minute speeches have followed the legislative business (see § 6.3, *supra*) and where there is no legislative business, one-minute speeches, like special orders, have extended for one hour (see § 6.5, *supra*).
3. See §§ 7.3, 7.4, *infra*.
4. See § 7.4, *infra*.

House Rule XV, clause 6, as amended in the 93d Congress (Apr. 9, 1974, H. Res. 998), now prohibits points of order of no quorum when the Speaker is recognizing Members to address the House under special orders with no measure pending.

requested; that sequence may be varied, or special orders for one day rescheduled to another day, by unanimous consent.⁽⁵⁾

Special orders to address the House may be requested either on the day of delivery or on a day in advance.

In Order After Legislative Business

§ 7.1 Under the modern procedure of the House, special orders of Members to address the House for more than one minute follow the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and may not preempt business which is privileged under the rules.

On Apr. 20, 1937,⁽⁶⁾ Majority Leader Sam Rayburn, of Texas, indicated the future procedure to be followed for conducting special-order speeches:

MR. RAYBURN: Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in this situation today, and it has been the situation several times since the Congress met. Unanimous consent has been secured by different gentleman to speak on a certain day. Today we have an hour and forty-five

minutes set aside for addresses immediately after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table. Hereafter I shall be called upon, when gentlemen get unanimous consent to speak on a day certain, to request that those unanimous consents shall be subject to matters like conference reports, privileged bills, and I think I may add special rules from the Committee on Rules. Today, as I have said, we have an hour and forty-five minutes devoted to addresses. There is a rule on the table which a great many Members think important, and I think the House is in favor of it. I am serving notice to this effect so that, if I have to make these conditions hereafter, Members will understand why they are made.⁽⁷⁾

On June 3, 1937,⁽⁸⁾ Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, ruled that a privileged report from the Committee on Rules took precedence over special-order speeches which had been obtained for that day, and the practice of special-order speeches was discussed:

MR. [JOHN J.] O'CONNOR of New York: Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 216.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from New York calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

5. See §§ 7.7, 7.8 (rescheduling) and §§ 7.10–7.12 (varying sequence), *infra*.

6. 81 CONG. REC. 3645, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

7. See also 84 CONG. REC. 125, 76th Cong. 1st Sess., Jan. 5, 1939, where Majority Leader Rayburn announced the policy of objecting to requests to address the House unless the address would follow the completion of the legislative program for the day.

8. 81 CONG. REC. 5307, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

MR. [CARL E.] MAPES [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. [BERTRAND H.] SNELL [of New York] rose.

THE SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to raise the point of order?

MR. MAPES: I simply wanted to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there are some special orders on the calendar.

THE SPEAKER: All special orders are contingent upon being called after the disposition of privileged matters.

MR. MAPES: The calendar of today does not so indicate, and that is the only point I have in mind.

MR. SNELL: Mr. Speaker——

THE SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

MR. SNELL: Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the special orders are in order at this time in preference to a resolution from the Committee on Rules.

MR. O'CONNOR of New York: Mr. Speaker——

THE SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

MR. O'CONNOR of New York: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. This question has been raised several times, and I have forgotten the date, but the Record will show that the Chair announced that from then on all special orders for addresses would be subject to, and would follow, any privileged matters to be brought up on that day.

MR. SNELL: Then, if there has been a ruling of the Chair, it should so state on the calendar that has been printed for today.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair thinks it proper to state in regard to the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York, that a good many days ago, in fact, several weeks ago, the Chair stated, not only once but probably two or three times, that where special orders were agreed to for gentlemen to address the House the understanding upon the part of the Chair would be that they should follow, and not precede, privileged matters that might be subject to be brought up by the House leadership or the Committee on Rules.

In this particular instance the Record of May 27, at page 6604, shows that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] submitted a request to speak today, as the Chair understands it and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rayburn], the majority leader, said:

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I must, of course, ask that the gentleman's time come after the disposition of privileged matters, such as conference reports, special rules, and so forth.

And the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] said:

I understand that.

So the gentleman evidently acquiesced in that statement.

MR. SNELL: I think the Chair is right about that.

MR. [JOHN E.] RANKIN [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. RANKIN: Does that mean that hereafter when there are special orders for gentlemen to speak, that if the Committee on Rules wants to consider any bill, it takes precedence over the special orders.

THE SPEAKER: That is the statement made by the Chair and acquiesced in by the House. It is a matter entirely with the House, of course, if an appeal is taken from that decision.

MR. O'CONNOR of New York: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. RANKIN: I yield to the gentleman from New- York, if I have the floor.

MR. O'CONNOR OF NEW YORK: Of course, Rules Committee never call up a rule without first consulting the Speaker and the majority leader.

MR. RANKIN: I understand. Here is what I am driving at. It certainly is not my view, and I doubt if it is the view of the House, that the Rules Committee can bring in a rule to consider any legislation and take a Member off the floor who has obtained unanimous consent to address the House. If that is the case, it simply means that the House is subservient to the Rules Committee so far as these special orders are concerned.

MR. [SAM] RAYBURN [of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I think this ought to be settled.

MR. SNELL: That is the reason that I raised this point at this time.

MR. RANKIN: I thank the gentleman from New York.

MR. RAYBURN: Mr. Speaker, being in the position that I am, I have to try to protect the program of the House. At least three times when unanimous consent has been requested I have made the statement that at all times I would object unless it were understood that the time asked for would come after conference reports, privileged bills, and special rules.

MR. RANKIN: Let me ask the gentleman from Texas this question.

There are at least three or four gentlemen who have special orders to speak today. If the Committee on Rules steps in under these orders and takes up the remainder of the afternoon, does that mean that these gentlemen shall have this time tomorrow?

MR. RAYBURN: No; it does not.

MR. RANKIN: Does it mean entirely taking the time away from them?

MR. RAYBURN: That is it.

On June 7, 1937, a colloquy took place on the place of special-order speeches in the business of the House:

THE SPEAKER [William B. Bankhead]: The gentleman propounds a parliamentary inquiry which is of some importance to the Chair. It is not the province of the Chair to undertake to say under what circumstances Members shall be allowed to address the House. The Chair thinks at this point there should be a firm decision and determination with reference to the particular question raised by the gentleman from New York. This matter arose a few days ago in the House, and the Chair stated at that time it was his understanding that all these consents which have recently been obtained have been based upon the premise that they would not be in order if there were a regular calendar call or if there were privileged matters which it was desired to call up before the speeches were made. Therefore, for the guidance of the Chair, the Chair thinks this matter ought to be definitely determined once and for all, in as much as the question has been raised.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. RANKIN: Would it not require an amendment to the rules of the House to establish a rule on this question? The far-reaching attitude assumed the other day would certainly amount to a change in the rules of the House, which must be submitted to the membership in written form. . . .

THE SPEAKER: In reply to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Rankin] the Chair is of the opinion it would not require a change of the rules to effectuate the procedure which has been suggested, but the Chair upon reflection is of the opinion that if a request is made such as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dickstein] has just made, that on Calendar Wednesday after the call of the committee having the call, he may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, the Chair would feel it to be his duty under such an agreement to recognize the gentleman from New York for 10 minutes.

The Chair desires to make the further observation, that this is a matter entirely within the control of the membership of the House. The leadership of the House or any individual Member may interpose at the time such a request is made the condition that the request shall follow privileged business. In order to protect the Chair and to remove from the shoulders of the Chair any responsibility with respect to saying what are privileged matters and what matters should be considered, the Chair thinks it only proper that that rule should be established.

MR. RAYBURN: Mr. Speaker, I have stated in the House over and over

again that when any Member rises and asks the privilege of addressing the House for the moment or for any day in the future, any Member of the House can prevent this by a single objection. I further stated that wanting to accommodate the Members of the House insofar as we can and yet protect and expedite the legislative program, that when any Member asks consent to address the House, it must be understood I would interpose an objection unless the Member understood and agreed that the time so requested would be subject to privileged matters, such as conference reports, privileged bills from committees that have the right to report privileged bills, reports from the Committee on Rules, or special rules making certain legislation in order.⁽⁹⁾

§ 7.2 It is the general custom that when the House starts on special order speeches, no further business will be transacted unless an emergency arises, although no rule of the House prohibits such transaction of business.

On Jan. 20, 1964,⁽¹⁰⁾ a unanimous-consent request made during special-order speeches was objected to:

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹¹⁾ Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized for 60 minutes.

MR. [WRIGHT] PATMAN: Mr. Speaker, since there is a Democratic caucus at

9. *Id.* at pp. 5373, 5374.

10. 110 CONG. REC. 614, 615, 88th Cong. 2d Sess.

11. Roland V. Libonati (Ill.).

10 o'clock tomorrow when we expected to have our committee meeting, we cannot have the committee meeting until 11 o'clock tomorrow. I therefore ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow afternoon the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be allowed to sit during general debate.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? . . .

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [of Iowa]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the parliamentary situation to be that we are on special orders?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: We are on special orders.

MR. GROSS: It has been the unwritten rule and the custom that when the House starts on special orders, business of general interest to the House is not to be transacted. In view of the fact that we now are on special orders, I must agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kilburn], that this request should be taken up tomorrow noon when we are in general session in the House.

MR. PATMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not permitting the gentleman's statement to go unchallenged.

MR. GROSS: I reserve the right to object. Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman has the floor, but the gentleman from Texas may propound a unanimous-consent request.

MR. GROSS: Of course, and it is also my privilege to reserve the right to object, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman is correct.

MR. GROSS: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I am constrained to object to the request.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Objection is heard.

§ 7.3 Special orders are normally scheduled to follow the legislative business of the day, but on occasion the Speaker has recognized for special orders prior to legislative business where the latter was not ready for floor consideration, and has on such occasions notified the House that there would be legislative business following special-order speeches.

Speaker Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, made the following announcement on Dec. 14, 1971:

The Chair would like to advise the Members that in order to get as much accomplished as we can, and in view of the fact that we have no legislative business ready at this moment, we will call special orders, and after they are completed declare a recess, unless legislative business is in order.

The Chair in making this announcement will state that we are not setting this as a precedent, but that we are calling special orders today, and then going back to the legislative business, if any, after recessing if necessary.⁽¹²⁾

A similar announcement was made on Oct. 14, 1972:

12. 117 CONG. REC. 46801, 92d Cong. 1st Sess.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair would desire to make a statement.

The Chair is going to call for special orders at this time.

The Chair desires also to notify the House that there will be business following the special orders. We are merely using this time now because we do not have any business ready for transaction before the House.

Does the gentleman from Missouri desire recognition at this time?

MR. [DURWARD G.] HALL [of Missouri]: Well, Mr. Speaker, is it contemplated that the special orders will follow if we adopt this unusual procedure, and then we will go back into legislative business? Heretofore most of us have always presumed that once the special orders had started we were free.

THE SPEAKER: That is why the Chair made that statement, because the Chair always heretofore adhered to the philosophy that there should be no business subsequent to the calling of special orders.

MR. HALL: The business of the House has been conducted in keeping with that procedure, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: It is the procedure we have always used heretofore.⁽¹³⁾

On Jan. 22, 1968, Majority Leader Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, made an announcement relating to the order of business:

MR. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, we have another matter of legislative business. More than an hour ago the Senate agreed to a resolution which we expect

to receive momentarily. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] have been standing by. I would like to advise Members that that resolution has to do with the extension of time for the filing of the President's Economic Report. If we do proceed with special orders, I would like the Members of the House to know that as soon as Senate Joint Resolution 132 comes over, we would like to take it up.

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [of Iowa]: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. ALBERT: I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

MR. GROSS: Does the gentleman anticipate any controversy over the matter?

MR. ALBERT: I have not heard of any point of controversy. There will be some discussion.⁽¹⁴⁾

On another occasion the House, having completed scheduled business, proceeded to special-order speeches, recessed to await a message from the Senate, and then acted on a conference report following the receipt of the message informing the House of the Senate's action thereon.⁽¹⁵⁾

§ 7.4 Unanimous-consent requests for the transaction of business are not customarily entertained after special orders have begun, but on oc-

13. 118 CONG. REC. 36446, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

14. 114 CONG. REC. 430, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.

15. 115 CONG. REC. 40227, 91st Cong. 1st Sess., Dec. 19, 1969.

casion the House has permitted the transaction of such legislative business after scheduled business has been concluded and special-order speeches have begun.

On Mar. 17, 1971,⁽¹⁶⁾ “special order” speeches had begun, following the conclusion of legislative business for the day. A unanimous consent request was made, discussed, and agreed to:

MR. [THOMAS P.] O’NEILL [Jr., of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration have permission until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁷⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [of Iowa]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of trying to ascertain here and now whether we are to follow the custom of no business of the House being transacted after embarking on special orders. That has been the custom in the past, and I should like to have some assurance from the Speaker or the distinguished majority whip that we can rely upon the custom that has been in practice for a long time, that no business will be transacted after special orders are begun.

MR. O’NEILL: I would be happy to answer the gentleman from Iowa.

16. 117 CONG. REC. 6848, 92d Cong. 1st Sess.

17. Brock Adams (Wash.).

MR. GROSS: I would be glad to have the answer.

MR. O’NEILL: When I went to the minority leader and explained to him what had happened, that this notification did not come to me until we went into special orders, the gentleman heard the colloquy. I went to the Speaker of the House, and the Speaker has assured us that it is unprecedented and it will not happen again during the session.

MR. GROSS: I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Limited to One Hour

§ 7.5 Special orders to address the House at the conclusion of the business of the day are limited to one hour per Member, and when a Member has used one hour, the Chair will decline to recognize him for extensions of time or for an additional special order.

On Feb. 9, 1966, Speaker pro tempore Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, declined to recognize a Member to request a second special order for the same day:

MR. [JOSEPH] RESNICK [of New York]: Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

MR. [JOHN BELL] WILLIAMS [of Mississippi]: I yield for that purpose.

MR. RESNICK: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a special order after all other special orders of the day and other legislative business of the day have been concluded to address the House for a period of 15 minutes.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair would advise the gentleman that pursuant to the practice of the House, Members are limited to a 1-hour special order per day. The Chair would be glad to entertain a request for a special order for a later day.⁽¹⁸⁾

On Oct. 30, 1967, Speaker pro tempore Henry B. Gonzalez, of Texas, advised a Member that he could only be recognized for one hour to speak under a special order, and that his time could not be extended, even by unanimous consent.⁽¹⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: Since Rule XIV clause 2, *House Rules and Manual* §758 (1979), provides that a Member may not be recognized for more than one hour of debate on any question, a special-order speech may not extend beyond one hour even by unanimous consent. However, another Member obtaining the floor in his own right may yield to a Member who has already consumed a special order.⁽²⁾

18. 112 CONG. REC. 2794, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

1. 113 CONG. REC. 30472, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.

2. 114 CONG. REC. 14265, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., May 21, 1968.

§ 7.6 A Member was granted a special order to address the House at the conclusion of other special orders previously granted (which totaled over 22 hours) with the understanding that his time would terminate at the end of 60 minutes or when the House convened on the next calendar day, whichever occurred earlier.

On Oct. 14, 1969,⁽³⁾ where the House had granted special orders totaling over 22 hours at the conclusion of business (with the intention of Members opposing the Vietnam conflict to keep the House in session throughout the night), another special order was granted as follows:

MR. [ROBERT L.] LEGGETT [of California]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 60 minutes for a special order either this afternoon or tomorrow morning immediately after the time allotted to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Halpern), my time to expire prior to the regular time that the House will convene tomorrow.

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁴⁾ Will the gentleman from California please repeat his request through the microphone so that all Members may hear the gentleman's request?

MR. LEGGETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and ex-

3. 115 CONG. REC. 29938, 29939, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

4. John W. McCormack (Mass.)

tend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that I be given unanimous consent—rather, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the House for 60 minutes, either this afternoon or tomorrow morning immediately after the time allotted to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Halpern), my said 60 minutes to expire prior to the regular time set for the convening of the House tomorrow morning. . . .

THE SPEAKER: . . . Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. Leggett)?

There was no objection.

Requesting and Rescheduling

§ 7.7 Special-order speeches may be rescheduled to a following day by unanimous consent, to precede special-order speeches scheduled for that day.

On Oct. 9, 1962,⁽⁵⁾ before the House adjourned out of respect to a deceased Member (Clement W. Miller, of California), a unanimous-consent request made by the Majority Leader was agreed to:

MR. [CARL] ABBERT [of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders heretofore entered for today be transferred to tomorrow and be placed at the top of the list of special orders for tomorrow.

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁶⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Special-order speeches were similarly transferred to the following day on July 22, 1963, due to the death of a Member.⁽⁷⁾

§ 7.8 When the House adjourns and does not reach special-order speeches scheduled for that day, such speeches are not automatically in order on the next legislative day; a unanimous-consent request to reschedule those special orders must be agreed to by the House.

On Jan. 26, 1971, Speaker Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, answered a parliamentary inquiry on rescheduling special-order speeches:

(Mr. Montgomery asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

MR. [GILLESPIE V.] MONTGOMERY [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader about the rescheduling of special orders. I was given unanimous consent for a special order on this Wednesday. In the light of the request of the majority leader that the House go over to Friday, I should like to ask him what procedures we should now follow.

MR. [HALE] BOGGS [of Louisiana]: The gentleman simply will have to ask unanimous consent that his special order be rescheduled for Friday or some other time.

5. 108 CONG. REC. 22850, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

6. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

7. 109 CONG. REC. 13004, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all special orders scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday of this week go over until Friday, January 29.

THE SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.⁽⁸⁾

Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, responded to a similar parliamentary inquiry on Mar. 29, 1960 (where the House had adjourned out of respect to a deceased Member on the previous day)

MR. [WILLIAM L.] SPRINGER [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I had a special order on yesterday for 40 minutes. My inquiry is, Does that special order hold over until today so that mine would be the first special order today?

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will have to ask unanimous consent to obtain a new special order.⁽⁹⁾

§ 7.9 The Chair declined recognition for a unanimous-consent request that a Member be permitted to address the House on a future day before legislative business.

8. 117 CONG. REC. 485, 92d Cong. 1st Sess.

9. 106 CONG. REC. 6823, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

On June 14, 1935,⁽¹⁰⁾ Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, declined to recognize for a unanimous-consent request:

MR. [KENT E.] KELLER [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday after the reading of the Journal and the completion of business on the Speaker's desk I may address the House for 15 minutes to answer an attack upon an amendment I proposed to the Constitution made in the Washington Times of June 12 by Mr. James P. Williams, Jr.

THE SPEAKER: Under the custom that prevails and the action of the Chair heretofore, the Chair cannot recognize the gentleman today to make a speech on Monday. The Chair hopes the gentleman will defer his request.

Sequence

§ 7.10 Special-order speeches are ordinarily made in the order in which permission has been granted to the requesting Members by the House, but the House may by unanimous consent change that order to accommodate Members.

On May 22, 1973,⁽¹¹⁾ Speaker pro tempore Tom Bevill, of Ala-

10. 79 CONG. REC. 9330, 74th Cong. 1st Sess.

As discussed previously, current practice requires special-order speeches to follow, not precede, legislative business.

11. 119 CONG. REC. 16578, 16579, 93d Cong. 1st Sess.

bama, recognized for a unanimous-consent request to change the sequence of special-order speeches:

MR. [DAVID W.] DENNIS [of Indiana]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order time assigned to me today be set over for tomorrow, and that I be granted a 60-minute special order at that time, as the first special order for tomorrow.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MR. [JOHN H.] ROUSSELOT [of California]: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. DENNIS: I yield to the gentleman from California.

MR. ROUSSELOT: Mr. Speaker, I make the same unanimous-consent request as made by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Dennis) that my special order for 60 minutes to be set over for tomorrow, and my special order follow immediately the special order of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Dennis).

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

§ 7.11 A Member having a special order was permitted by unanimous consent to relinquish the floor temporarily to allow the Member having the next special order to use part of his own time.

On July 11, 1966, the House agreed to a unanimous-consent re

quest varying the regular order of special-order speeches:

MR. [THOMAS B.] CURTIS [of Missouri]: I would be happy to agree. I do have a difficult problem. I have a live broadcast coming through at exactly 1 o'clock, so I shall go into the cloakroom to do that. If I could proceed for about 5 minutes and then have the gentleman proceed, when I am finished out there I could proceed further, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman. Would that be agreeable?

MR. [WRIGHT] PATMAN [of Texas]: That would be agreeable, or I could go ahead until the gentleman has finished.

MR. CURTIS: Whichever the gentleman prefers. Either will work out.

MR. PATMAN: That will be satisfactory.

With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may be allowed to proceed for 5 minutes at this time, with the time to be taken from his time, and that I may be permitted to resume after he finishes.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹²⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is recognized.⁽¹³⁾

§ 7.12 By unanimous consent, a Member may be granted a special order to speak ahead

12. Sam M. Gibbons (Fla.).

13. 112 CONG. REC. 14988, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

of those already scheduled for special orders.

On July 14, 1965,⁽¹⁴⁾ a unanimous-consent request related to the sequence of special-order speeches was objected to:

MR. [SIDNEY R.] YATES [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of those who have been previously granted a special order, to address the House for 30 minutes today relative to the death of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁵⁾ The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for 30 minutes as the first special order, with the consent of other Members who have obtained special orders, in relation to the death of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

MR. [WILLIAM T.] CAHILL [of New Jersey]: Mr. Speaker, I regret I must object.

Mr. Speaker, I regretted very sincerely what I considered to be a requirement to interpose an objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois. I only did it because there were a great number of people from my district who were here in anticipation of the special order I had requested some time ago and because a great many of the Members had evidenced a keen interest in the subject matter. However, I fully recognize the great importance of and the great contribution that our

late and respected and beloved Ambassador to the United Nations has made to this country. In deference to that and out of respect for his memory, I would ask that I be permitted to relinquish the time heretofore asked and that my special order go over to a later date and that I be permitted to yield the 1 hour I have in a special order to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] and all those who would like to pay tribute to the memory of the late Adlai Stevenson.

MR. YATES: I thank the gentleman.

THE SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

On Jan. 29, 1971,⁽¹⁶⁾ Speaker Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, announced that he would, by unanimous consent, recognize the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations for special-order speeches immediately following the reading of the President's budget message and ahead of other Members who had special orders previously scheduled for that day.

§ 8. Varying the Order of Business

Generally, the regular order of business may be varied either by

14. 111 CONG. REC. 16845, 89th Cong. 1st Sess.

15. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

16. 117 CONG. REC. 990, 92d Cong. 1st Sess.